



Mr. Mill says (throughout I am quoting from his work on Sir W. Hamilton) that the conception of Self is the result of a much wider generalization than that of matter (p. 206). How late therefore must be the conception of other selves ! At first, then, the notion of matter can only be that of *our* possible sensations. But when we do not yet know our own minds, our own selves, how can we know our own sensations and their possibilities ? For though sensation may be before perception, a *general conception of permanent possibilities* of sensation must involve consciousness of *myself*, and of these sensations as *possible for me*. Even *if* this general notion were obtainable before that of self ; it could not be that of *matter*, for matter involves explicit reference to *mind* : matter is substance viewed as different from mind, and *vice versâ*.

I need only observe further, that Mr. Mill gives up his cardinal doctrine of the merely relative validity of our knowledge when he adopts the foregoing explanation of an external world. His inconsistency in admitting the real existence of minds external to one another is fully equal to that which he charges on Hamilton for admitting the external reality of matter. But, in fact, since we are said by Mr. Mill to infer the minds of others from their bodies, if their bodies are not known as outside ourselves, their minds cannot be so known. These other minds and bodies, then, are general notions of our own. Yet (as Mr. Masson has put it) we must conceive these minds, since they are like our own, as conceiving our minds to be general notions of theirs. So that I conceive a consciousness, which is mine, conceiving my consciousness as not mine. Talk of bewildering *German* metaphysics after this !

RODEN NOEL.



Contemporary Review October 1871

PROSPECTS OF THE NEW GERMAN REFORMATION.

CONSIDERING the radical differences which distinguish the Roman from the Protestant modes of thought, it is not surprising that the agitations now disturbing the theological atmosphere of Germany should be inadequately appreciated by English writers in general. On the whole, indeed, I am disposed to think that Protestant journalists have displayed a very creditable amount of caution in their speculations as to the final results of the conflict already begun. It is satisfactory to read so little in the way of repetition of the old commonplaces about the scarlet lady, the idolatries of benighted Papists, and the contrast between Protestant orthodoxy and Romish Paganism. It is pleasant to see that among the most anti-Roman theologians and politicians there are many who candidly aim at a comprehension of the true facts of the case, and decline to adopt the old-fashioned divisions of parties, according to which everybody on one side was an honest man, and everybody on the other either a knave or a fool.

Still, there are few signs that the English public really understands the nature of the principles which are arrayed against one another in Bavaria, in Prussia, and elsewhere, both in Northern and Southern Germany. Every little fresh incident that occurs, in which Rome and her former obedient children seem to be in conflict, is magnified to an unreal importance. If the secular government upholds a

recalcitrant priest against his bishop, or a knot of lay professors repudiate all thought of bowing the knee to Rome, or it is whispered that many of the priesthood have subscribed with unconvinced minds to the Vatican decree, it is augured that these are tokens of some tremendous religious revolution, and are the first mutterings of a storm which may shake the whole Roman Church to its foundations.

With all my heart I wish that I could share these interpretations of the phenomena of the hour. With all my knowledge of the personal merits of not a few of the Roman laity and clergy, my conviction of the fatal influences of the intellectual and moral despotism, which is the vital essence of the Roman system, is so strong, that I hail every fresh defection from her communion as so far a gain to the ultimate triumph of what I believe to be the truth. But it is in vain to allow "the wish to be father to the thought," in this, as in all other matters of doubt and difficulty. Sincerely and cordially as I venerate the great leader of the new movement, I cannot think that he and his friends, some of whom are my own friends also, will be able to make good their position, or that any permanently extensive religious organization is about to be established, either in Bavaria, or in any other part of Germany. That great good will come from the resistance which Dr. Döllinger is offering to the Papal autocracy I do not for a moment question. That this resistance is also a real step towards the final overthrow of the Roman power, which is destined some day to be accomplished, I do not in the least degree doubt or deny. On the contrary, I am satisfied that it has a distinct tendency in this direction. But, in the meantime, I am satisfied that the attitude taken up by the "Old Catholic" party cannot possibly be maintained; and that the attempt to set up a new Catholicism, minus the Papal autocracy, must utterly and rapidly collapse and vanish away.

I will attempt to explain my reasons for thus thinking, so briefly as not to exceed the limits to which I must confine myself. In the first place, here are none of the elements which have invariably been present in every previous case of vast religious revolution with which we are acquainted. In order that a theological movement may spread widely among the masses of the people, and overthrow existing ecclesiastical organizations, it is necessary that it should be directed against certain moral abuses or manifest religious impostures, such as the popular understanding can comprehend and the popular feeling can detest. The world will never rise in anger against abstruse questions of history, or philosophy, or theological criticism. If the people are to be roused, they must be touched to the quick of themselves. The scandals against which reformers preach must be open, intelligible,

and outraging such notions of right and wrong as the multitude holds dear. And the dogmas which it is proposed to substitute for the dogmas denounced must be simple, and must rest upon some basis which the most ignorant can comprehend, and about which there is no dispute whatsoever.

Such were the elements of the revolution accomplished by Moses, when he brought the Jews out of Egypt, and finally established the Hebrew race as an independent people, organized upon the basis of a pure monotheism. Such were the conditions of the new creed preached some hundreds of years afterwards by Buddha in India. Such, looking at the propagation of Christianity itself under its more human aspect, was the reform accomplished by Christ and his Apostles after Him. Such was the extensive revival of practical religion which was wrought by Dominick and Francis of Assisi in the Middle Ages. Such, again, was the Reformation itself, when Rome presented certain frightful abuses as the mark for the blows of the reformers, and one or two special and simple doctrines served as the shibboleth of the party of revolt. It was the same, still later, in England, when Wesley and Whitefield took the field against the absolute paganism and debasement of the lowest and lower middle classes of English society, and preached their easily intelligible dogmas of regeneration and justification. In all these cases the reformers had some monster of ignorance or corruption to strike at, and some practical substitute for existing belief which all men could understand and personally adopt as their own.

But what is this that the "Old Catholic" party in Germany are fighting for? A highly subtle theological distinction, resting upon recondite historical inquiries, and pre-supposing an acquaintance with remote facts, of which the world in general knows little, and for which it cares nothing. Monstrous as is the Papal claim to infallibility when tested by the old maxim of Vincent of Lerins, that nothing is to be regarded Catholic which has not been believed *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, how is it possible that the vast mass of the Roman Catholic world, both clergy and laity, and even in learned Germany itself, should enter with heartiness into any such dispute? The world was never yet revolutionized on a question of history. No saying was ever more true than that of Thucydides, when he wrote that the multitude are indisposed to the search after truth, and that they love convictions which come ready to their hand. When Dr. Döllinger and his supporters and sympathisers imagine that mankind are to be moved to enthusiasm for the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod omnibus*, they are imputing to ordinary men and women that passionate love for truth, and especially historical truth, which they themselves feel, but about which the

enormous majority of religious people are supremely indifferent. To argue with sincerely devoted adherents to the Pope that he cannot be infallible, because the dogma originated in forgeries several hundred years ago, and because Popes have taught flagrantly inconsistent doctrines, is only a fresh example of that passion for trying to cut blocks with a razor, which is so far from uncommon with acute and learned minds.

Whatever, again, may be thought on the matter by English Protestants, the Roman Church does not exhibit, as a rule, those flagrant scandals which are of a nature to arouse popular indignation, and which give life to the arguments of controversial assailants. In Germany especially, as in England, Ireland, France, and America, the Roman clergy are, as a body, men of respectability; the members of religious orders live quiet lives in their convents and monasteries, or if they are known in the world, it is as zealous teachers or as self-sacrificing sisters of charity. Where their abuses are more marked, as in Italy or in Spain, the priests, monks, and nuns are remarkable rather for laziness and incompetence, than for those outrageous violations of their own principles of morals which the eye of the multitude detects, and which awaken the storms of popular indignation. There is little in the existing condition of Roman Catholicism which is at all parallel to its features in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. If it fails to make any deep impression upon the masses of the people, and its doctrines are repellent to the more educated of the higher classes in Catholic countries, it does not awaken any very fierce bitterness or angry contempt, unless where, as in France, it comes into conflict with an energetic party like that of the Communist and Socialist schools.

Nor is it any answer to this view to reply that the pretensions of the priesthood are regarded with contempt by large sections of the people in all nominally Catholic countries. Contempt is an emotion of which active reformers can make little use in their efforts at revolutionising with a view to reconstruction. People who treat the theological system of Rome and the ways of her clergy with scorn, are not likely to trouble themselves very much with any schemes for her violent overthrow. We are all, I think, rather apt to forget this, when we are told of the contempt with which the creed of Rome is regarded by influential men abroad, and to the alienation of the working classes from her practical system. When we notice the striking contrast between the ways of men and of women in France, Germany, or Italy, and see that the fathers of families so frequently despise the practices which their wives and daughters devoutly cherish, we argue most illogically upon their probable future personal conduct. In reality, this philosophic disdain has little or nothing in

it that is akin to the spirit of active reform. If only the Pope and the priesthood will not meddle too far, your scornful sceptic will not lift his finger to substitute some other active religious body in their place. Contempt is not the stuff out of which theological reformers are made. The kings, and princes, and nobles, and burghers, who banded together for the destruction of the Roman system in the sixteenth century, were roused by passions more fiery than any quiet philosophic aversion.

The calmness with which the abolition of the convents and the alienation of Church property in Italy has been received by the influential classes of Italians, of various ranks, is a proof of the possibility of uniting a readiness to strip the clergy of their goods, with a marked disinclination for setting up a distinctly anti-Papal religious society. Three centuries ago, such a thing would have been impossible. Men did not seize the revenues of the Church, or demolish convents, and appropriate them to their own benefit, without openly breaking with Rome altogether. They never abolished Romanism without at the same time setting up a doctrinal Protestantism; and they never quarrelled with the Pope in secular things, without quarrelling also with him in spiritual things. But so vast a change has come over the mind of Europe since the Reformation period—a change which in itself is purely Protestant in its tendencies—that whole nations will now make free with the revenues of the Pope, and at the same time hold themselves his thoroughly loyal spiritual subjects. And this is because his spiritual pretensions are now regarded with a supercilious contempt by the more influential minds of professedly Catholic countries. When men do not trouble themselves to hate the religious creed of Rome, they help themselves to the Papal property for the benefit of the State, and never exert themselves to interfere with the faith of the populace.

This same fact, again, that kings and nobles do not now appropriate Church lands and palaces for their personal benefit, is surely, if read aright, a significant token of the feebleness of the purely religious element now involved in disputes with Rome. When men in power openly enriched themselves at the expense of the Roman clergy, their whole nature, with all its worst passions, was involved in the conflict. If Rome were not anti-Christian, or infamously vile, where was the justification of all these spoliations? And how could Rome be reduced to the position of an impotent anathematiser, except by the erection of some fundamentally anti-Roman Church, which should give the Pope back his curses in kind, and enlist the enthusiasm of the plebeian horde in defence of patrician and royal robbers? Nowadays the procedure is quite different. This new idea of the secular State, as an institution, existing for the benefit of

the people, and ultimately having a right to the control of all property whatsoever, has silently modified the entire cast of modern thought. There can be no sacrilegious robbery, it is felt, when monasteries and bishoprics have to yield up the revenues which they waste or misuse, for the benefit of the whole people, for the diminution of taxation, and the education of all classes. This is not plunder, but a resumption of rights long since in abeyance, and may be effected by an orthodox Catholic with a perfectly good conscience. If the Pope chooses to anathematise governments which take this view, that is his affair. We are superior to him in enlightenment, say the secular powers. There must be two parties to a quarrel, and we have not the remotest intention either of giving him back the property that he pretends to claim, or of setting up an opposition church in his face.

Viewed, in the next place, as a theological dogma, the Vatican decree on Papal infallibility does not really offer any more difficulties, from the non-historical point of view, than does the doctrine which assigns infallibility to the entire Church, on which the German "Old Catholics" take their stand. There is nothing in it which runs counter to the feelings, instincts, and practical habits of the Roman Catholic world in general, and, consequently, nothing on which the "Old Catholic" can appeal to the people. I would venture to remind the English reader that the doctrine of infallibility, in itself, whether in its Papal or non-Papal form, does not present itself to the Roman Catholic mind in that repellent guise which it wears in Protestant eyes. It is no more repellent to the Catholic, whether learned or unlearned, devout or worldly, than was the doctrine of verbal Biblical inspiration in the eyes of all Anglicans and Protestants up to a very recent period. To the unbiassed Protestant critic the belief in the infallibility of a living Pope appears simply ludicrous. It is impossible for the imagination to divest itself of those associations of common-place humanity which stand in startling contrast with a claim to divine inspiration. We see the absolute logical impossibility of drawing a distinction between the utterances in which Pius IX. speaks like one of ourselves, and those in which he is the channel through which the voice of God himself is to be heard. The moment we can look facts in the face, and bring our idol into the light of day, out of the haze of golden mist in which our fancy had enshrouded him, we detect the imposture, unconscious as is that imposture on the part of the idol himself. We see at once that the theory of Papal infallibility is not only impossible; it is absurd.

But this is not so with the vast majority of Roman Catholic believers. With them the living Pope is habitually invested with

the attributes of "the divinity which doth hedge a king," and their imagination never attempts to realize the phenomena of his personality as a sinful and erring mortal. Take the common idea which the most loyal and most ignorant English women entertain respecting the Queen and her family, or concerning royal and imperial potentates in general. See how they invest their characters and lives with a sort of superhuman beauty, and glory, and freedom from human infirmities; how, in a word, they "worship" them in the secret penetralia of their beatified career; and then apply all these bright illusions to the case of the Pope. The actually existing Pope, as he is in reality, with all his intensely human nature, his blunders, his faults, his virtues, his rash talk, his billiard-playing, his mingled Italian craft and impulsiveness, his cleverness, his imperviousness to reason, his love of political liberty and his passion for ecclesiastical despotism, his subservience to the Jesuits and his personal distaste for them, such as he is in the eyes of those among whom he lives,—such a personage, I say, is an unknown being to the millions whom he governs. In their eyes he sits apart from all sublunary affairs, like a grand Llama of Thibet or a spiritual king in Japan, in the midst of that sacred and eternal Rome, which is the seat of everything that is pious, venerable, learned, just, loving, and ascetic. To the foreign ecclesiastics, indeed, who visit Rome, and become acquainted with its realities, it is the city of disenchantment, and they feel renewed difficulties in believing that the dogma of Papal infallibility is anything better than a barren theological proposition, to be maintained at all hazards against all comers. But it is not the habit of disenchanted ecclesiastics to reveal ugly facts to their flocks, or to do anything that may tend to what they call "disedification." The imagination of the ordinary Roman Catholic is therefore left free to feed itself upon its dreams, and to cultivate the pleasant worship with which it venerates the living Pope as a being not very far from an incarnate God. Against such a disposition of mind, the elaborate historical disquisition of the "Old Catholic" German theologians are directed in vain. They are like the offering of a translation of Plato's "Republic" to a mob shouting in frenzied delight at the condescension of an emperor or empress in the streets of Berlin or St. Petersburg. Rome and the Pope are living, splendid, powerful realities; and what, in comparison, does the multitude care for the difficulties of antiquarians, who, after all, are no more infallible than the rest of the world?

Contrasting, too, the ultramontane theory of the infallibility of the Pope with the "Old Catholic" theory of the infallibility of the whole church, speaking through the voice of Ecumenical Councils, so far as theological and philosophical difficulties are concerned, there is not

the shadow of a difference between the two. And this identity is instinctively felt by the entire body of Roman Catholics, lay and clerical, who, with so few exceptions, have practically accepted the Vatican decree. In the nature of things, there is no more difficulty in attributing infallibility to a single living Pope, than in attributing it to an assembly of several hundred dead bishops. In the case of the latter, it is true that "distance lends enchantment to the view," and the miracle seems no longer a thing utterly incongruous with its surroundings. The fancy paints a gathering of devout, learned, and reverend fathers, the fitting instruments for the enunciation of supernatural doctrine. Everything that might indicate the presence of human infirmities, human passions, and human ignorance, is forgotten, and the whole scene suffused with a celestial glow, from the midst of which eternal truths proceed in harmonious numbers, to become from henceforth the symbolic hymns of the faithful in all ages. But in reality there was nothing more supernatural about the fathers of the great councils than there is about Pius IX. He is one, and they were many; and theologically, philosophically, and historically, it is just as impossible to believe that the voice of God spoke by their lips as to believe that it now speaks in a Papal brief or bull. To the vulgar, unthinking Roman Catholic I suspect that there is even less difficulty in accepting the infallibility of a single Pope than that of some hundreds of bishops. The average believer is so completely possessed with anthropomorphic notions of the Divinity, that he will suspect that it is easier for God to make one man infallible than to compel the discordant thoughts of an episcopal multitude into one single inspired unanimity. But, be this as it may, it is unquestionable that when the "Old Catholic" school would fall back upon the ancient anti-ultramontane view, they have no practical ground on which to appeal to the miscellaneous multitude, whether lay or clerical. It is just as easy to believe in the decree of the Vatican Council as in the decrees of Nice, or Ephesus, or Chalcedon. What "the faithful" ask for, is to be told now what they are to believe, and as to whether or not this creed has been believed, *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, they are as supremely indifferent as they are to the authenticity of a Vatican manuscript of the New Testament, or the history of the Rosetta stone.

If, further, we look at home, we shall be enabled easily to realise this indifference, and to understand the eagerness with which the Roman Catholic world accepts, rather than repudiates, the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope. Judged by all laws of right reason, what can be more ludicrous than the implicit confidence which thousands and thousands of Protestants, of all schools, place in the teaching of some individual clergyman or minister? They see him

in all his human personality, just as the prelates and cardinals, and other privileged Catholics, see the Pope in the familiarity of private life. They know that the object of their worship is a fallible and sinful man, and that there is not one single token about him that suggests the presence of a supernatural power which may give his judgment a claim to be listened to and received. They are aware that he has often changed his opinions, and been just as dogmatically positive in favour of some assertion as he is now dogmatically positive against it. They are conscious that numerous other persons, as good, as learned, as able as he is, entertain views in direct contradiction to those which he announces to be the teaching of the Holy Ghost. But for all this, they believe in him with all the abject fervour of the most extreme Ultramontane. Their intellect prostrates itself before his definitions and his anathemas, and congratulates itself on being blest with such a guide. How, then, can we be surprised at the quiet acquiescence with which the Roman communion has adopted the late Vatican decree? It is not more preposterous than the claims to deference which are put forward by hundreds of Protestant teachers, and which their devotees find peace in believing. The Roman theory of infallibility is but the systematised and avowed form of the pretension which the clergy of all churches are too apt to claim for themselves, and to which mankind is only too happy to submit. The looker-on detects the absurdity of the pretensions, and smiles at the devotion of those who accept them, but he argues and smiles in vain. So it is when Archbishop Manning puts forward his pretensions and those of the Roman Pontiff. His assertions are shown to be untrue, his arguments fallacious, and his whole theory self-destructive. But what then? He goes on asserting as positively as ever, and those who feel inclined to believe in him go on still believing. What they want is not truth, but a freedom from troublesome facts, and the opiate of a loudly proclaimed dogmatic creed, sweetened with an elaborate ceremonial and the incessant guidance of the confessional.

In such a condition of Christendom, what hope has the dawning Reformation, now shedding its first rays of light in Bavaria? If it is to make its way, and establish itself by founding a new branch of the Church, which shall retain the characteristic dogmas of the Council of Trent, purified from later Ultramontane corruptions, where, further, we must ask, are the leaders to direct it? Even supposing that the existing moral and doctrinal condition of the Roman communion is generally such as to present marks for the blows of popular controversialists, and that such controversialists are prepared with a living substitute for the system they would uproot, where, I say, are the men to effect the revolution? Wide-spread

revolutions of opinion, leading to organic religious changes, must necessarily be the work of one or two men, possessing gifts of an extraordinary kind, and combining in themselves not merely force of character, but rare popular eloquence accompanied with the practical organising faculty. Such men have been the vital forces which have wrought out every vast religious change in the world's history. Every religious revolution has borne the impress of the individuality of some one single leader, or of some one or two of his immediate associates or followers. It is true that such men are as much the creation of their age as they are its leaders; but they must exist. Without Moses, where would have been the deliverance of the Jews from Egypt, and what would have been the character stamped upon the legislation of the newly-established Hebrew nation? Doubtless, Moses was himself the natural and characteristic product of the race whom he led to freedom and victory. If he had not been so, he never could have become their leader, their master, and their legislator. But he ruled them, not simply because his personal nature was essentially one with their own, but because he enforced the fundamental ideas of the monotheism which he taught with an energy, a fierceness, a fire, and a strength before which their passions quailed, and to which all that was good and strong within them did willing homage. And, accordingly, what we call the Mosaic system is pre-eminently a reflex of the faith and character of its wonderful founder.

Some five or six hundred years afterwards—for we are in the dark as to the exact date—a far more extensive religious revolution was brought about in the farther East by the extraordinary man whom Asia and Europe have agreed to describe as Buddha the sage. Of his personality we know but little; and we can only frame conjectures, more or less justifiable, as to the precise nature of the creed he taught. There is reason to believe that in some respects it presented a more exact anticipation of the Christian morality than was known to the Jews. But one fact is certain. That gigantic reformation which shook the populations of Asia, and which has issued in the establishment of a religion, which in its corrupted forms still numbers far more adherents than does Christianity itself, was due to the character and the teaching of one individual man.

When Christianity at length appeared, as soon as its Divine Founder had left the world, the modelling of the faith he had left to his disciples fell, to a large extent, under the dominion of one masterful mind. The religion of Christendom for eighteen hundred years has borne the indelible impress of the mind of St. Paul. I am not now discussing the question as to the nature of that modification of the teachings of Christ which resulted from the influence of St. Paul's nature upon the original and simpler faith. According to

one school, the Gospel, as taught by the great apostle, merely passed through his mind, as a ray of white light passes through a prism and re-appears, not indeed changed, but resolved into elements of exquisite hue. According to another, the Pauline religion is really a modification of pure Christianity, resulting from the introduction of elements essentially foreign, or from modes of presentation to the intelligence which injure its purity, and interfere with its steady influence upon mankind. But be this as it may, it is undeniable that to this hour the peculiarities of the temperament of St. Paul are dominant throughout Christendom. Sacerdotalism, from which he would have shrunk, has been engrafted upon his system in the Roman, the Greek, and the High Anglican creeds; but taken as a whole, the Christianity of eighteen centuries has reflected the theology of that great and enthusiastic nature, which bowed itself prostrate on the road to Damascus before the name of Jesus of Nazareth.

In the middle ages, two conquering men came forward and reformed the inner, practical life of the Roman Church, and stamped upon its devotion and its ideas of God a character which it has not yet shaken off. In Dominick and Francis of Assisi we recognise once more the astonishing powers of individualism in vivifying the dormant elements of religious feeling, and moulding generation after generation to one personal pattern. It was the same in after times with the founder of the Jesuits. That wonderful society to this hour bears the impress of the individuality of Ignatius Loyola. The intensity and the profoundly military character of his temperament are reflected in the whole Jesuit body, and amidst all the varieties of national peculiarities which are exhibited by individual Jesuits.

At the Reformation period it is a mere commonplace to point to the part played by a few vehement natures, and to the helplessness of all efforts at reform, where the leadership did not fall into the hands of characters formed to arouse and guide the storms of popular feeling. Without Luther in Germany, without Calvin in France and Switzerland, without Knox in Scotland, where would have been the German, the French, the Swiss, and the Scotch Reformations? Granting all that may be said of the prevalence of suicidal Roman scandals, and of the preparation of the popular mind for radical religious changes, it is still true that the leadership fell into the hands of a small number of men of rare personal capacities for the practical ruling of their fellow-creatures.

In England the Reformation was the work of a combination of influences, among which a purely religious and popular feeling was one of the least powerful. We have known but one really religious revolution, and that was the revolution of Methodism. Here was a true conflict between religious and non-religious ideas, between con-

servatism and radicalism in theology, between quiet piety in helpless alliance with worldliness, and fiery fanaticism in alliance with a passionate desire for a knowledge of God and for salvation. And here, as in all similar cases, the work was due to one or two men. Without the personal influences resulting from the personal characters of Wesley and Whitefield, Methodism would never have been. And their influence is all the more pregnant as an illustration of what I am saying, because neither Wesley nor Whitfield was the inventor of the peculiarities of Methodism. They found its essential elements already existing in the Moravian communities and the teaching of Zinzendorf, and in the small societies which in the eighteenth century were struggling against the irreligion of the times in English life. It was only when the existing systems of reform were taken in hand by men possessing the capacities for popular leadership that Methodism became a real power in the country, and the revolution began.

But where are the leaders of German or English or Italian "Old Catholic" thought now? The school consists of scholars and theologians and professors, and the few laymen who may be influenced by their writings. Of course I do not for a moment deny that some new leader may appear, destined to popularise the recondite labours of the present guides of the movement. But until the victorious nature does appear, I fear that the Roman authorities will remain masters of the field, so far as the purely religious aspects of the new reformation are involved. The priesthood will remain, as now, all but unanimous in their submission to the anathemas of Rome; and the adherents of the few courageous theologians who dare to think for themselves, will be for the most part drawn from the body of the laity who are more influenced by dislike of Roman political pretensions than by an ardent love for Christianity in its ancient purity.

From this point of view, indeed, it is quite possible that the new anti-Papal movement may be productive of most momentous consequences. To a certain extent, we may witness a reproduction of the conflict between the secular power and the Papacy, which made the Reformation in England a possible thing. No one who is acquainted with the real facts of the English Reformation can please himself with the fiction that it was in any sense, in its origin, a popular or theological movement. It was brought about by the conflicting interests of kings and popes. And so it may be now in Bavaria, and in other parts of Germany, where Roman Catholicism is powerful. Changes, which Dr. Döllinger and his supporters will never effect, will in all probability be brought about by the Pope and his advisers themselves. Bavarian Catholics may be supremely

indifferent to the claims of Church history, but Bavarian governments will be resolutely determined to uphold their rights against bishops, popes, and cardinals. It is in the consecration of the monstrous assertions of the famous Syllabus, and their conjunction with the assertion of Papal Infallibility, that the Court of Rome is playing the losing game. German sovereigns will remain unmoved when the priesthood merely transfer the ground for believing in transubstantiation from the Council of Trent to the Theologians of the Vatican and the Pope, their mouthpiece. It will affect them no more than the popular belief in any alleged modern miracle. States are not shaken by Addoloratas, or appearances at Salette, or by processions in honour of relics at Treves. On the contrary, the Gallios of European Courts are somewhat gratified at such manifestations of the non-inquiring, non-critical spirit in these restless days. But the moment it comes to the flinging in their faces of such flagrant revolutionisms as are embodied in the Papal syllabus, we have the stories of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth over again. When kings and emperors and chancellors are assured, by a *soi-disant* infallible pope, that the groundwork on which their authority rests is a delusion, and that the only power which has a claim upon men's consciences for obedience is that of the Pope himself, we may, I think, be satisfied that affairs cannot possibly remain as they are, and that a revolution of some sort is at hand.

But, unless I am utterly mistaken in the religious phenomena of the times, that revolution will not take the shape of the establishment of a reformed Catholic community, on the model put forth by the "Old Catholic" party of Munich. Their sympathisers in this country seem to look forward to the setting up of some Church, very much after the style of the Established Church of England. Roman Catholicism, without the Papal despotism and stripped of its ultramontane corruptions, will, they think, assume a shape not unlike that which the High Church school attributes to the Anglican Church, as they interpret the Anglican idea.

To myself, this expectation seems purely visionary. When Germans, or any other foreign Catholics, separate themselves from Rome, it will not be to set up a continental Anglicanism in her place. Anglicanism is a phenomenon unique in the history of mankind. The Church of England can no more be reproduced elsewhere than among the offshoots of the English people, than can our Queen, Lords and Commons, and all the other minglings of virtues and vices which are characteristic of Englishmen. What we shall probably witness in Germany will be that dissociation between the Church and the State, which is one of the most general effects of modern political and religious ideas throughout the world. The

German governments will sever their connection with the Pope, and leave him to anathematise their ideas on science and society at his will. He thus anathematises them in England and North America, his followers now recognising these anathemas as the utterances of an infallible authority, but nobody is affected by it. The curses are *vox et præterea nihil*. It is Jupiter thundering, and that is all.

And that such a separation between the German states and the Papal authority will tell powerfully upon the advance of religious enlightenment seems certain. The upholding of Roman influence to any extent by the governments of Germany, is so far a crushing of that freedom of thought which lies at the root of the Roman system. And for this reason, while upholding the present union between Church and State in England, I should rejoice to see all such union annihilated when the State allies itself with Rome. The establishment of Anglicanism in England is the establishment of comprehensiveness; the establishment of Catholicism abroad is the establishment of intolerance. As I honestly believe that the cause of religious freedom gains, on the whole, by the maintenance of our existing system, anomalous as it is, so I am equally satisfied that every species of alliance between the secular power and Rome is a gain to the cause of spiritual slavery. Thus, therefore, with all my heart, I rejoice to watch the growing support which Dr. Döllinger and the "Old Catholics" are every day gaining. I do not despair because they count but few adherents among the priesthood or the devout laity, for I see no elements at work which can give birth to a wide-spread popular religious movement. But I am thankful to see the old story again renewed, and to behold the grasping secular ambition of the Roman Court coming into conflict with the ideas of national sovereignty and independence. Since the struggle cannot be fought out upon theological and spiritual issues, I rejoice that it should be transferred to collateral grounds, and I am happy in believing that in assailing nations and sovereigns, the Papacy is once more making a gigantic mistake.

J. M. CAPES.



THE BURLESQUE AND THE BEAUTIFUL.

“*As in a glass!*” saith the favourite stage motto. I cry you mercy, my lord manager! As for the folks who pay, would ye see your faces like grinning masks in yonder mirror, or like those that are hopeful and believe in angels? Resolve me that now, my masters.”—*Old Play.*

IT is remarkable what pleasure the British nation takes in ugliness, with regard to general amusements both in private and public. Perhaps there is no nation among which female beauty or prettiness is more universally admired and courted; but in most other respects, and especially in subjects and objects of amusement and general taste, the love of the grotesque, the comic, the exaggerative and caricature, the broadly farcical, and even the downright ugly, have for a long time been a very marked peculiarity. The late Richard Duppa, the art-critic, used to say that such was the effect of female beauty, even upon the unromantic imagination of the British, with whom a respectable “position” in society was all-important, that he was convinced that the humblest servant maid or peasant girl, of more than average personal attraction, could make sure of settling well in life, and above her station, if she took due care of herself. How is it, then, that the same race of men have a perverted eye as to form and expression, and in so many other respects, and particularly in matters of amusement—graphic, literary, scenic, dresses, dances, and gesticulations? The comic, the broad-farcical, and all the phases of



